

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 2007 ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM
October 24, 2007

THE STATE OF TEXAS

In 2007, the State of Texas achieved *Academically Acceptable* status, with:

- ✓ TAKS passing rates of **83** percent or above for all students and all student groups for reading/ELA, writing, and social studies, **64** percent or above for all students and all student groups for mathematics, and **56** percent or above for all students and all student groups for science; and
- ✓ SDAA II percent met ARD expectations of **89** percent for all students; and
- ✓ Grade 9-12 completion rates of **83.9** percent or above for all students and all student groups; and
- ✓ Grade 7-8 dropout rates of **0.8** percent or less for all students and all student groups. A more rigorous dropout definition is used for the first time in the 2007 rating system.

Compared to the 2006 TAKS results at the 2007 student passing standards, the 2007 statewide performance on the TAKS was equal to or improved for all students and all student groups in each subject area tested.

Completion Rate I, the rate that excludes GED recipients as completers, declined for all students and for each student group between the class of 2006 and the class of 2005. Decreases in completion rates may be due to significant changes in the dropout definition beginning with the 2005-06 school year.

Annual dropout rates for 2005-06 cannot be compared to the prior year due to definitional changes. The dropout rate for students in grades 7-8 in 2005-06 varies across the all students group and each of the individual student groups from a low of 0.2% for white students to a high of 0.8% for African American students.

DISTRICTS

Of the **1,222** districts, **27** districts (**2.2%**) are rated *Exemplary* and **217** (**17.8%**) are rated *Recognized* in 2007. The districts rated *Exemplary* comprise **0.5%** of the total student enrollment, while the districts rated *Recognized* comprise **5.6%** of total students enrolled.

920 of the **1,222** districts achieved the *Academically Acceptable* rating and comprise **93.2%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **61** charter operators achieving the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating under AEA procedures.

56 districts are *Academically Unacceptable* representing **0.7%** of the total students enrolled. This includes **2** charter operators rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

2 districts (both charter operators) are *Not Rated: Other*. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

- ✓ **20** of the **27** *Exemplary* districts are small (total enrollment less than 1,000), and **56%** are rural (**15** of the **27**).

- ✓ 80% of *Recognized* districts are small, having fewer than 1,000 students enrolled. Approximately one-third (37%) of *Recognized* districts have 30% or more minority students enrolled; 65% have 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.

CAMPUSES

Of the 8,061 campuses, 643 campuses (8.0%) are rated *Exemplary* and 2,354 (29.2%) are rated *Recognized* in 2007. The campuses rated *Exemplary* comprise 7.6% of the total student enrollment, while campuses rated *Recognized* comprise 28.0% of total students enrolled.

4,108 of the 8,061 campuses rated (51.0%) achieved the rating *Academically Acceptable* and comprise 59.3% of the total students enrolled. This includes 386 campuses rated *AEA: Academically Acceptable* under AEA procedures.

276 of the 8,061 campuses rated (3.4%) are rated *Academically Unacceptable* and comprise 3.6% of the total students enrolled. This includes 9 campuses rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* under AEA procedures.

680 campuses are *Not Rated: Other*. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

A large majority (86%) of the 643 schools rated *Exemplary* are elementary schools (555), with the remainder distributed among 20 high schools, 61 middle schools, and 7 multi-level schools.

The 2,354 *Recognized* schools are profiled as follows:

- 71% are elementary;
- 21% are middle schools;
- 6% are high schools; and
- 3% are multi-level schools.

Of the 276 *Academically Unacceptable* schools in 2007, their ratings were as follows in 2006:

- 58 were *Academically Unacceptable*.
- 1 was *Exemplary*.
- 10 were *Recognized*.
- 175 were *Academically Acceptable*.
- 12 were *AEA: Academically Acceptable*.
- 3 were *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*.
- The remaining 17 were either *Not Rated: Other*, or did not exist in 2006.

The 267 schools rated *Academically Unacceptable* under standard procedures are distributed among 115 elementary schools, 50 middle schools, 86 high schools, and 16 multi-level schools.

96% of *Academically Unacceptable* schools rated under standard procedures are in districts with 40% or more economically disadvantaged students.

CHARTERS

Charter Operators

2007 marks the fourth year that charter operators are rated.

Of 191 charter operators, 8 are *Exemplary* (4.2%), 27 are *Recognized* (14.1%), 119 are rated *Academically Acceptable* (62.3%), and 35 are *Academically Unacceptable* (18.3%).

Of the 119 *Academically Acceptable* charters, 58 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 61 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 35 *Academically Unacceptable* charters, 33 were evaluated under standard procedures and 2 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

Charter Campuses

Of the 332 charter campuses, 15 are rated *Exemplary* (4.5%) and 37 are rated *Recognized* (11.1%). Together, the *Exemplary* and *Recognized* categories represent 18.3% of all students enrolled in a charter school. 217 charter campuses are rated *Academically Acceptable* (65.4%). 44 charter campuses are rated *Academically Unacceptable* (13.3%).

Of the 217 *Academically Acceptable* charter campuses, 80 achieved this rating under standard procedures and 137 achieved the rating under AEA procedures.

Of the 44 *Academically Unacceptable* charter campuses, 40 were evaluated under standard procedures and 4 were evaluated under AEA procedures.

The remaining 19 charter campuses (5.7%) are *Not Rated: Other* and comprise 4.1% of the total students enrolled in a charter school. See the topic "Not Rated Districts and Campuses" below for more information about this rating category.

MOVEMENT

Under certain circumstances the initial rating assigned can be changed. Reasons for a rating change include the following: small numbers requiring special analysis; additional requirements in the system (*Academically Unacceptable* campuses); the consequences of granted appeals; or, in 2007, the application of the School Leaver Provision.

Special Analysis, Districts

As a result of special analysis, 9 districts that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. 2 districts moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. 1 district moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Not Rated: Other*. Another 1 district moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Not Rated: Other*. 5 districts moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Special Analysis, Campuses

As a result of special analysis, 47 campuses that had very small numbers of students tested on TAKS had rating changes. 34 of the 47 campuses received the rating *Not Rated: Other* since there was not sufficient data to assign a rating. 11 campuses received the rating *Academically Acceptable* based on special analysis and 2 received the rating *Recognized* based on special analysis.

In 2007, a School Leaver Provision (SLP) has been added to the system, such that the leaver indicators (either alone or in combination) cannot be the cause for a lowered campus or district rating. This provision has been created primarily to accommodate the change in the definition of a dropout. For campuses and districts evaluated under standard procedures, the provision applies to the Underreported Students Indicator (for districts only), the grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate, and Completion Rate I. The SLP also applies to campuses and charter operators evaluated under AEA Procedures. For 2007 AEA ratings, if the Completion Rate II and/or grade 7-12 Annual Dropout Rate indicator(s) are the only cause for an *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* rating, then the AEC or charter is assigned the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* label.

School Leaver Provision, Districts (Standard Procedures)

As a result of the SLP, a total of 67 districts were able to achieve a higher rating. 65 districts that would otherwise have been *Academically Unacceptable* used the SLP to achieve a higher rating. 64 moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. 1 moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Recognized*. Another 2 moved from *Academically Acceptable* to a higher rating: 1 to *Recognized*, and 1 to *Exemplary*. Overall, districts used the SLP most often for completion rate (32), and then for dropout rate (25). 8 districts used the SLP for both dropout rate and completion rate. 2 used it for excessive underreported students.

School Leaver Provision, Campuses (Standard Procedures)

As a result of the SLP, a total of 151 campuses were able to achieve a higher rating. 138 campuses that would otherwise have been *Academically Unacceptable* used the SLP to achieve a higher rating. 13 moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Recognized*, and 125 moved from *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*. Another 12 used the SLP to move from *Academically Acceptable* to a higher rating. 8 moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*, 4 moved from *Academically Acceptable* to *Exemplary* and 1 moved from *Recognized* to *Exemplary*. Overall, campuses used the SLP more often for the dropout rate (90) than for the completion rate (60). One campus used the provision for both the dropout rate and the completion rate.

School Leaver Provision (AEA Procedures)

As a result of the SLP, a total of 181 campuses were able to achieve the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating. In the vast majority of cases, the SLP was used for the dropout rate (132 campuses). 7 campuses used the SLP for the Completion Rate II and another 42 used it for both the dropout and completion rate indicators. A total of 32 charter operators used the SLP to achieve the *AEA: Academically Acceptable* rating. Of these 32, there were 19 that used it for both the dropout and completion rate indicators. 10 used it for the dropout rate only and 3 used it for Completion Rate II only.

Academically Unacceptable Campuses

One district was prevented from achieving the rating of *Recognized* due to having one or more of its campuses rated *Academically Unacceptable*. This district received a rating of *Academically Acceptable*.

ADDITIONAL FEATURES IN THE SYSTEM

Required Improvement

Under standard procedures, **360** campuses were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2007. Of the **2,354** *Recognized* campuses, **291** campuses (**12.4%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the **3,722** *Academically Acceptable* campuses under standard procedures, **69** campuses (**1.9%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Under standard procedures, **37** districts were able to demonstrate Required Improvement in order to achieve a higher rating in 2007. Of the **217** *Recognized* districts, **29** districts (**13.4%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Acceptable* to *Recognized*. Of the **859** *Academically Acceptable* districts under standard procedures, **8** districts (**0.9%**) used Required Improvement to move from a rating of *Academically Unacceptable* to *Academically Acceptable*.

Required Improvement was most often used for the mathematics and science subject areas.

Note that due to changes in the dropout definition, Required Improvement is not available as a feature for the grade 7-8 dropout rate indicator this year. However, RI is a feature available for use with the completion rate. In 2007, **1** campus and **1** district were able to achieve *Recognized* by demonstrating RI for Completion Rate I.

Exceptions

210 campuses were able to avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating due to the exceptions provision. **173** campuses used one exception, **34** campuses used two exceptions and **3** campuses used all three allowable exceptions. **Six** campuses were prevented from using exceptions because an exception was used for the same measure last year.

31 districts were rated *Academically Acceptable* due to exceptions provision. **30** districts only needed one exception to avoid the *Academically Unacceptable* rating. **1** district used two exceptions, and no district used three exceptions.

At the campus level, exceptions were most often used for science (**87**) and mathematics (**65**), followed by fewer used for social studies (**38**), Reading/ELA (**27**), Writing (**24**), and SDAA II (**9**).

At the district level, exceptions were used most often for science and mathematics.

HURDLES

Under standard procedures, there are a total of 36 possible measures (hurdles) used to determine the accountability rating depending on the size and diversity of the campus or district. No campus is evaluated on all 36 – the greatest number of hurdles evaluated in 2007 is **30** for one campus.

For campuses, the accountability ratings are based on a statewide average of **13** hurdles. For elementary schools, the average number of hurdles is **12**, compared to an average of **15** hurdles for middle schools and

15 for secondary schools. Charter schools that are evaluated under standard procedures are held accountable for 9 measures on average.

For districts, the average number of hurdles statewide is 18. The ten major urban districts are evaluated on an average of 35 hurdles, while the 427 rural districts are evaluated on an average of 13 hurdles.

Among the 267 *Academically Unacceptable* campuses, the average number of hurdles evaluated is 14. Among 643 *Exemplary* campuses, the average number of hurdles is 10.

ACADEMICALLY UNACCEPTABLE REASONS

Standard Procedures

District

Of the 54 *Academically Unacceptable* districts in 2007, 50 received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; and 4 received the rating due to a combination of the base indicators.

Campus

Of the 267 schools rated *Academically Unacceptable*, 220 (82%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; 1 received the rating due to SDAA II only; and, the remaining 46 received the rating due to a combination of indicators.

Alternative Education Accountability (AEA) Procedures

District

Of the 2 *AEA: Academically Unacceptable* charter operators in 2007, 1 received the rating due to TAKS only, and 1 received the rating due to a combination of dropout rate and poor performance on TAKS.

Campus

Of the 9 schools rated *AEA: Academically Unacceptable*, 3 (33%) received this rating due to poor performance on TAKS only; 6 received the rating due to a combination of the base indicators.

NOT RATED DISTRICTS AND CAMPUSES

District

2 districts, both charter operators, are *Not Rated: Other* because, through the process of special analysis, it was determined there was not sufficient data upon which to base a rating.

Campus

680 of the 8,061 campuses rated (8.4%) are assigned the rating *Not Rated: Other* and comprise 1.5% of the total students enrolled. Under standard procedure, 676 campuses are *Not Rated* for the following reasons:

PK-K Only	151
Disciplinary Alternative Education Program (DAEP)	182
Juvenile Justice Alternative Education Program (JJAEP)	190
Special Analysis	34
No TAKS results	118
Appeal granted	1

TAKS PARTICIPATION

- The number of tested students who are included in the accountability subset of assessment results used to determine the 2007 accountability ratings is 2,784,910 or 91.6% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11. A higher percentage of students was included in the accountability subset in 2007 (91.6%) compared to 2006 (90.5%).
- The number of tested students who did not affect the August accountability ratings because they were not enrolled in the district by the end of October, 2006 is 165,629 or 5.4% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11.
- When all test takers are considered, 97.7% of all students enrolled in grades 3-11 were tested, compared to 97.0% in 2006.
- In 2007, the percent of students exempted from the TAKS was 1.3 percent (0.3 ARD, 1.0 LEP), compared to 1.7 percent (0.7 ARD, 1.0 LEP) in 2006.
- In 2007, 0.2 percent of students were absent from testing - the same percent as reported from 2004 to 2006.

RATING TRENDS – 2004 THROUGH 2007

- The first few years of the new accountability system presented the dual challenge of increasing student-level passing standards on TAKS combined with other increases in rigor to the system: increasing standards; decreases in minimum size criteria for both the dropout and completion rate indicators; and definitional changes to base indicators such as SDAA, completion rate, and annual dropout rate.

- From 2004 to 2007, the percent of *Exemplary* and *Recognized* campuses (combined) was 39.1% in 2004, 27.9% in 2005, 42.6% in 2006, and 37.2% in 2007. The percent of *Academically Unacceptable* campuses has increased from 2004 to 2006: 1.2% in 2004, to 3.3% in 2005, to 3.6% in 2006, and dropped to 3.4% in 2007.
- From 2004 to 2007, the percent of *Exemplary* and *Recognized* districts (combined) was 32.4% in 2004, 14.9% in 2005, 29.0% in 2006, and 20.0% in 2007. The percent of *Academically Unacceptable* districts has increased each year from 2.0% in 2004, to 4.2% in 2005, to 4.5% in 2006 to 4.6% in 2007.
- The table below provides counts of districts and campuses with repeating ratings in consecutive years.

	<i>Exemplary</i> each year for the past:			<i>Recognized</i> each year for the past:			<i>Academically Unacceptable</i> * each year for the past:		
	4 years	3 years	2 years	4 years	3 years	2 years	4 years	3 years	2 years
Number of Districts	3	1	2	48	13	78	0	3	11
Number of Campuses	151	42	181	580	266	695	4	11	43

*In this table, *Academically Unacceptable* includes AEA: *Academically Unacceptable*. Also, *Academically Unacceptable* ratings separated by one or more years of *Not Rated* are considered consecutive.

The columns in this table are mutually exclusive. For example, the 2-year counts indicate campuses and districts with repeated ratings for *exactly* 2 years. The 2-year counts do not include those who also have repeated ratings for 3 years or 4 years.

GOLD PERFORMANCE ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In 2001, the Texas Legislature created the Gold Performance Acknowledgment (GPA) to publicly recognize districts and campuses for high performance on indicators that are in addition to those used to determine state accountability ratings. Districts are eligible for a maximum of 12 possible GPAs in 2007; campuses are eligible for a maximum of 14 possible GPAs in 2007. The number of acknowledgments possible at the campus level varies by school type.

Table of Possible Acknowledgments by School Type

Indicator	Elementary	Middle / Jr. High	High School	Multi-Level	District
Advanced Course/Dual Enrollment Completion			✓	✓	✓
Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results			✓	✓	✓
Attendance Rate	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commended Performance on Reading/ELA	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commended Performance on Mathematics	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Commended Performance on Writing	✓	✓		✓	✓
Commended Performance on Science	✓		✓	✓	✓
Commended Performance on Social Studies		✓	✓	✓	✓
Comparable Improvement: Reading/English Language Arts	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Comparable Improvement: Mathematics	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program			✓	✓	✓
SAT/ACT Results			✓	✓	✓
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: English Language Arts			✓	✓	✓
Texas Success Initiative – Higher Education Readiness Component: Mathematics			✓	✓	✓
Total Possible Acknowledgments	7	7	13	14	12

Statewide in 2007, approximately **76%** of the 1,157 districts evaluated for GPA and **78%** of the 6,980 campuses evaluated for GPA earned one or more acknowledgments, compared to **82%** and **82%** respectively in 2006. Two districts earned all 12 district acknowledgments, no districts earned 11, and another five districts earned 10.

No campuses earned all 14 acknowledgments, but one campus earned 13, two campuses earned 12, and 12 campuses earned 11. A total of 1,271 campuses (**18%**) earned one acknowledgment, 1,246 (**18%**) earned two acknowledgments, and 997 (**14%**) earned three acknowledgments.

At the campus level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was commended on reading/ELA (**31.4%**), followed by commended on writing (**27.1%**), and commended on mathematics (**24.5%**). The acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT), with less than 1% of campuses (47) earning this accolade.

At the district level, the most frequent acknowledgment earned was the Texas Success Initiative in Mathematics (**37.8%**), followed by the Texas Success Initiative in English language arts (**35.3%**), commended on social studies (**31.4%**), and commended on writing (**30.4%**). As with the campuses, the acknowledgment earned the fewest times was the college admissions acknowledgment (SAT/ACT) with just over 2% of districts (28) earning this accolade.